

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 30, 2000

**SENATE BILL**

**No. 1662**

**Introduced by ~~Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review~~  
*Senator Burton***

February 22, 2000

---

---

~~An act relating to the administration of state government, An act to amend Sections 14556.5, 14556.26, 14556.40, 14556.50, and 14556.52 of, to add Section 14556.29 to, and to repeal Section 14556.40 of, the Government Code, to amend Section 7104 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, to amend Sections 2182 and 2182.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, and to repeal Section 21 of Chapter 91 of the Statutes of 2000, relating to transportation, making an appropriation therefor, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.~~

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1662, as amended, ~~Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review~~ *Burton. Administration of state government Transportation: finance.*

(1) Existing law establishes the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (hereafter the TCRF) in the State Treasury and appropriates the money in the TCRF (a) to the Department of Transportation for allocation, as directed by the California Transportation Commission, to the department and certain regional and local transportation entities for certain listed transportation projects, (b) to the Controller for allocation to cities, counties, and cities and counties for street and road maintenance, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, (c) to the commission for the purposes of a specified funding exchange

program, and (d) to the department for rehabilitation and repaving projects on state highways. Existing law establishes a list of transportation projects eligible for funding with money from the TCRF, specifies the lead applicant for each project, and establishes a procedure for the lead applicant to apply to the commission for funds for each project.

Existing law requires the Controller to transfer specified amounts on a quarterly basis from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund (hereafter the TIF) in the State Treasury. The Controller, for each quarter during the period commencing on July 1, 2001, and ending on June 30, 2006, is required to transfer specified amounts from the TIF to the TCRF, to the Public Transportation Account, a trust fund in the State Transportation Fund, to the Department of Transportation, to the counties, including a city and county, and to the cities, including a city and county, for specified transportation purposes. Funds transferred to counties, cities, and cities and counties are required to be deposited in certain local accounts, as specified, in order to avoid the commingling of those funds with other local funds and may be used only for street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and storm damage repair, as defined. Cities, counties, and cities and counties are required to maintain their existing commitment of local funds for street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and storm damage repair in order to remain eligible for allocation of the specified funds.

This bill would make technical and clarifying corrections in these provisions, including changing the lead agency for certain transportation projects on the specified project list.

The bill would require the Controller to develop a system that provides access to funds allocated by the commission from the TCRF by electronic transfer of funds.

The bill would make an appropriation by adding a project to the transportation project list and specifying the amount to be allocated to that project.

The bill would appropriate \$13,900,000 from the Public Transportation Account in the State Transportation Fund to the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority and the Bay Area

Water Transit Authority, in specified scheduled amounts and for specific purposes.

The bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

~~This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to make the necessary statutory changes to implement the Budget Act of 2000 relative to the administration of state government.~~

~~This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.~~

Vote: <sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub>. Appropriation: ~~no~~ yes. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1    ~~SECTION 1. It is the intent of the Legislature in~~  
2    *SECTION 1. Section 14556.5 of the Government*  
3    *Code is amended to read:*  
4    14556.5. The Traffic Congestion Relief Fund is hereby  
5    created in the State Treasury. The fund shall include  
6    deposits of ~~funding funds~~ provided in the annual Budget  
7    Act, provided from the Transportation Investment Fund  
8    established under Section 7104 of the Revenue and  
9    Taxation Code, or provided under any other ~~legislation~~  
10   *statute*. Notwithstanding Section 13340, the money in the  
11   fund is hereby continuously appropriated to the  
12   department, without regard to fiscal years, ~~for~~ *as follows:*  
13   (a) *For allocation by the department, as directed by*  
14   the commission pursuant to Section 14556.20, to the  
15   department and other regional and local transportation  
16   entities for the projects listed in Article 5 (commencing  
17   with Section 14556.40) ~~to~~.  
18   (b) *For allocation by the Controller, the sum of four*  
19   *hundred million dollars (\$400,000,000), for allocation*  
20   *during the 2000–01 fiscal year to cities, counties, and cities*  
21   *and counties pursuant to Section 2182 of the Streets and*  
22   *Highways Code, and to.*  
23   (c) *For allocation by the commission for to the funding*  
24   exchange program authorized by Section 182.8 of the  
25   Streets and Highways Code.

1 SEC. 2. Section 14556.26 of the Government Code is  
2 amended to read:

3 14556.26. A regional or local agency receiving an  
4 allocation from this program shall certify, by resolution of  
5 its governing board, before final execution of the  
6 cooperative agreement, that it will sustain its level of  
7 expenditures for transportation purposes at a level that is  
8 consistent with the ~~level~~ *for average of its annual*  
9 *expenditures during the 1997–98, 1998–99, and 1999–2000*  
10 *fiscal year years*, including funds reserved for  
11 transportation purposes, during the fiscal years that the  
12 allocation provided under this chapter is available for use.  
13 The certification is subject to audit by the state.

14 SEC. 3. Section 14556.29 is added to the Government  
15 Code, to read:

16 14556.29. The Controller shall develop a system that  
17 provides access to funds allocated by the commission  
18 under this article from the Traffic Congestion Relief  
19 Fund by electronic transfer of funds.

20 SEC. 4. Section 14556.40 of the Government Code, as  
21 added by Section 1 of Chapter 92 of the Statutes of 2000,  
22 is repealed.

23 ~~14556.40. (a) The following projects are eligible for~~  
24 ~~grants from the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund,~~  
25 ~~established by Assembly Bill No. 2928 of the 1999–2000~~  
26 ~~Regular Session, for the purposes and amounts specified:~~

27 ~~(1) BART to San Jose; extend BART from Fremont to~~  
28 ~~Downtown San Jose in Santa Clara and Alameda~~  
29 ~~Counties. Seven hundred twenty five million dollars~~  
30 ~~(\$725,000,000). The lead applicant is the Santa Clara~~  
31 ~~County Valley Transportation Authority.~~

32 ~~(2) Fremont-South Bay Commuter Rail; acquire rail~~  
33 ~~line and start commuter rail service between Fremont~~  
34 ~~and San Jose in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties.~~  
35 ~~Thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000). The lead~~  
36 ~~applicant is the Santa Clara Valley Transportation~~  
37 ~~Authority.~~

38 ~~(3) Route 101; widen freeway from four to eight lanes~~  
39 ~~south of San Jose, Bernal Road to Burnett Avenue in Santa~~  
40 ~~Clara County. Twenty five million dollars (\$25,000,000).~~

~~The lead applicant is the department or the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.~~

~~(4) Route 680; add northbound HOV lane over Sunol Grade, Milpitas to Route 84 in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties. Sixty million dollars (\$60,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency.~~

~~(5) Route 101; add northbound lane to freeway through San Jose, Route 87 to Trimble Road in Santa Clara County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.~~

~~(6) Route 262; major investment study for cross connector freeway, Route 680 to Route 880 near Warm Springs in Santa Clara County. One million dollars (\$1,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.~~

~~(7) Caltrain; expand service to Gilroy; improve parking, stations, and platforms along UPRR line in Santa Clara County. Fifty five million dollars (\$55,000,000). The lead applicant is Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.~~

~~(8) Route 880; reconstruct Coleman Avenue Interchange near San Jose Airport in Santa Clara County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.~~

~~(9) Capitol Corridor; improve intercity rail line between Oakland and San Jose, and at Jack London Square and Emeryville stations in Alameda and Santa Clara Counties. Twenty five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority.~~

~~(10) Regional Express Bus; acquire low-emission buses for new express service on HOV lanes regionwide. In nine counties. Forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). The lead applicant is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.~~

~~(11) San Francisco Bay Southern Crossing; complete feasibility and financial studies for new San Francisco Bay~~

~~crossing (new bridge, HOV/Transit bridge or second BART tube) in Alameda and San Francisco or San Mateo Counties. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.~~

~~(12) Bay Area Transit Connectivity; complete studies of, and fund related improvements for, the I-580 Livermore Corridor; West Contra Costa County and Route 4 Corridors in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Seventeen million dollars (\$17,000,000). The lead applicant for the I-580 study is the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency; and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority is the lead applicant for the West Contra Costa and Route 4 studies.~~

~~(13) CalTrain Peninsula Corridor; acquire rolling stock, add passing tracks, and construct pedestrian access structure at stations between San Francisco and San Jose in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties. One hundred twenty-seven million dollars (\$127,000,000). The lead applicant is the Peninsula Joint Powers Board.~~

~~(14) CalTrain; extension to Salinas in Monterey County. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the Transportation Agency for Monterey County.~~

~~(15) Route 24; Caldecott Tunnel; add fourth bore tunnel with additional lanes in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.~~

~~(16) Route 4; construct one or more phases of improvements to widen freeway to eight lanes from Railroad through Loveridge Road, including two high-occupancy vehicle lanes, and to six or more lanes from east of Loveridge Road through Hillcrest. Thirty-nine million dollars (\$39,000,000). The lead applicant is the Contra Costa Transportation Authority.~~

~~(17) Route 101; add reversible HOV lane through San Rafael, Sir Francis Drake Boulevard to North San Pedro Road in Marin County. Fifteen million dollars~~

~~(\$15,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Marin Congestion Management Agency.~~

~~(18) Route 101; widen eight miles of freeway to six lanes, Novato to Petaluma (Novato Narrows) in Marin and Sonoma Counties. Twenty-one million dollars (\$21,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Sonoma County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(19) Bay Area Water Transit Authority; establish a regional water transit system beginning with Treasure Island in the City and County of San Francisco. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the Bay Area Water Transit Authority.~~

~~(20) San Francisco Muni Third Street Light Rail; extend Third Street line to Chinatown (tunnel) in the City and County of San Francisco. One hundred forty million dollars (\$140,000,000). The lead applicant is the Municipal Transportation Agency.~~

~~(21) San Francisco Muni Ocean Avenue Light Rail; reconstruct Ocean Avenue light rail line to Route 1 near California State University, San Francisco, in the City and County of San Francisco. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the Municipal Transportation Agency.~~

~~(22) Route 101; environmental study for reconstruction of Doyle Drive, from Lombard St./Richardson Avenue to Route 1 Interchange in City and County of San Francisco. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(23) CalTrain Peninsula Corridor; complete grade separations at Poplar Avenue in (Burlingame), 25th Avenue (San Mateo), and Linden Avenue (South San Francisco) in San Mateo County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant is the San Mateo County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(24) Vallejo Baylink Ferry; acquire low-emission ferryboats to expand Baylink Vallejo-San Francisco service in Solano County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Vallejo.~~



~~(25) I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange in Fairfield in Solano County; 12 interchange complex in seven stages (Stage 1). Thirteen million dollars (\$13,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Solano Transportation Authority.~~

~~(26) ACE Commuter Rail; add siding on UPRR line in Livermore Valley in Alameda County. One million dollars (\$1,000,000). The lead applicant is the Alameda County Congestion Management Authority.~~

~~(27) Vasco Road Safety and Transit Enhancement Project in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Eleven million dollars (\$11,000,000). The lead applicant is Alameda County Congestion Management Authority.~~

~~(28) Parking Structure at Transit Village at Richmond BART Station in Contra Costa County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Richmond.~~

~~(29) AC Transit; buy two fuel cell buses and fueling facility for demonstration project in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Eight million dollars (\$8,000,000). The lead applicant is the Alameda Contra Costa Transit District.~~

~~(30) Implementation of commuter rail passenger service from Cloverdale south to San Rafael and Larkspur in Marin and Sonoma Counties. Thirty-seven million dollars (\$37,000,000). The lead applicant is the Sonoma-Marín Area Transit Authority.~~

~~(31) Route 580; construct eastbound and westbound HOV lanes from Tassajara Road/Santa Rita Road to Vasco Road in Alameda County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Alameda County Congestion Management Authority.~~

~~(32) North Coast Railroad; repair and upgrade track to meet Class II (freight) standards in Napa and Humboldt Counties. Sixty million dollars (\$60,000,000). The lead applicant is North Coast Rail Authority.~~

~~(33) Bus Transit; acquire low-emission buses for Los Angeles County MTA bus transit service. One hundred fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000). The lead applicant is~~



~~the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(34) Blue Line to Los Angeles; new rail line Pasadena to Los Angeles in Los Angeles County. Forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). The lead applicant is the Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority.~~

~~(35) Pacific Surfliner; triple track intercity rail line within Los Angeles County and add run-through tracks through Los Angeles Union Station in Los Angeles County. One hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~

~~(36) Los Angeles Eastside Transit Extension; build new light rail line in East Los Angeles, from Union Station to Atlantic via 1st Street to Lorena in Los Angeles County. Two hundred thirty six million dollars (\$236,000,000). The lead applicant is the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(37) Los Angeles Mid-City Transit Improvements; build Bus Rapid Transit system or Light Rail Transit in Mid-City/Westside/Exposition Corridors in Los Angeles County. Two hundred fifty-six million dollars (\$256,000,000). The lead applicant is the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(38) Los Angeles San Fernando Valley Transit Extension; (A) build an East-West Bus Rapid Transit system in the Burbank-Chandler corridor, from North Hollywood to Warner Center. One hundred forty-five million dollars (\$145,000,000). (B) Build a North-South corridor bus transit project that interfaces with the foregoing East-West Burbank-Chandler corridor project and with the Ventura Boulevard Rapid Bus project. One hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000). The lead applicant for both extension projects is the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(39) Route 405; add northbound HOV lane over Sepulveda Pass, Route 10 to Route 101 in Los Angeles County. Ninety million dollars (\$90,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(40) Route 10; add HOV lanes on San Bernardino Freeway over Kellogg Hill, near Pomona, Route 605 to Route 57 in Los Angeles County. Ninety million dollars (\$90,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(41) Route 5; add HOV lanes on Golden State Freeway through San Fernando Valley, Route 170 (Hollywood Freeway) to Route 14 (Antelope Valley Freeway) in Los Angeles County. Fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(42) Route 5; widen Santa Ana Freeway to 10 lanes (two HOV + two mixed flow), Orange County line to Route 710, with related major arterial improvements, in Los Angeles County. One hundred twenty-five million dollars (\$125,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(43) Route 5; improve Carmenita Road Interchange in Norwalk in Los Angeles County. Seventy-one million dollars (\$71,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(44) Route 47 (Terminal Island Freeway); construct interchange at Ocean Boulevard Overpass in the City of Long Beach in Los Angeles County. Eighteen million four hundred thousand dollars (\$18,400,000). The lead applicant is the Port of Long Beach.~~

~~(45) Route 710; complete Gateway Corridor Study, Los Angeles/Long Beach ports to Route 5 in Los Angeles County. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~

~~(46) Route 1; reconstruct intersection at Route 107 in Torrance in Los Angeles County. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(47) Route 101; California Street off-ramp in Ventura County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead~~

~~applicant is the department or the Ventura County Transportation Commission.~~

~~(48) Route 101; corridor analysis and PSR to improve corridor from Route 170 (North Hollywood Freeway) to Route 23 in Thousand Oaks (Ventura County) in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. Three million dollars (\$3,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~

~~(49) Hollywood Intermodal Transportation Center; intermodal facility at Highland Avenue and Hawthorn Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Los Angeles.~~

~~(50) Route 71; complete three miles of six-lane freeway through Pomona, from Route 10 to Route 60 in Los Angeles County. Thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(51) Route 101/405; add auxiliary lane and widen ramp through freeway interchange in Sherman Oaks in Los Angeles County. Twenty-one million dollars (\$21,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(52) Route 405; add HOV and auxiliary lanes for 1 mile in West Los Angeles, from Waterford Avenue to Route 10 in Los Angeles County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.~~

~~(53) Automated Signal Corridors (ATSAC); improve 479 automated signals in Victory/Ventura Corridor, and add 76 new automated signals in Sepulveda Boulevard and Route 118 Corridors in Los Angeles County. Sixteen million dollars (\$16,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Los Angeles.~~

~~(54) Alameda Corridor East; build grade separations on BNSF and UPRR lines, downtown Los Angeles to Los Angeles County line in Los Angeles County. One hundred fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000). The lead~~

1 applicant is the San Gabriel Valley Council of  
2 Governments.

3 (55) Alameda Corridor East; build grade separations  
4 on UPRR line, Los Angeles County line to Colton, with  
5 rail-to-rail separation at Colton in San Bernardino  
6 County. Ninety-five million dollars (\$95,000,000). The  
7 lead applicant is the San Bernardino Associated  
8 Governments.

9 (56) Metrolink; track and signal improvements on  
10 Metrolink; San Bernardino line in San Bernardino  
11 County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead  
12 applicant is the Southern California Regional Rail  
13 Authority.

14 (57) Route 215; add HOV lanes through downtown  
15 San Bernardino, Route 10 to Route 30 in San Bernardino  
16 County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The  
17 lead applicant is the department or the San Bernardino  
18 County Transportation Commission.

19 (58) Route 10; widen freeway to eight lanes through  
20 Redlands, Route 30 to Ford Street in San Bernardino  
21 County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead  
22 applicant is the department or the San Bernardino  
23 County Transportation Commission.

24 (59) Route 10; Live Oak Canyon Interchange in the  
25 City of Yucaipa in San Bernardino County. Eleven million  
26 dollars (\$11,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
27 department or the San Bernardino County  
28 Transportation Commission.

29 (60) Route 15; southbound truck climbing lane at two  
30 locations in San Bernardino County. Ten million dollars  
31 (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
32 San Bernardino County Transportation Commission.

33 (61) Route 10; reconstruct Apache Trail Interchange  
34 east of Banning in Riverside County. Thirty million  
35 dollars (\$30,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
36 department or the Riverside County Transportation  
37 Commission.

38 (62) Route 91; add HOV lanes through downtown  
39 Riverside, Mary Street to Route 60/215 junction in  
40 Riverside County. Forty million dollars (\$40,000,000).

~~The lead applicant is the department or the Riverside County Transportation Commission.~~

~~(63) Route 60; add seven miles of HOV lanes west of Riverside, Route 15 to Valley Way in Riverside County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Riverside County Transportation Commission.~~

~~(64) Route 91; improve the Green River Interchange and add auxiliary lane and connector ramp east of the Green River Interchange to northbound Route 71 in Riverside County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Riverside County Transportation Commission.~~

~~(70) Route 22; add HOV lanes on Garden Grove Freeway, Route I 405 to Route 55 in Orange County. Two hundred six million five hundred thousand dollars (\$206,500,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Orange County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(73) Alameda Corridor East; (Orangethorpe Corridor) build grade separations on BNSF line, Los Angeles County line through Santa Ana Canyon in Orange County. Twenty-eight million dollars (\$28,000,000). The lead applicant is the Orange County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(74) Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line within San Diego County, add maintenance yard in San Diego County. Forty-seven million dollars (\$47,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or North Coast Transit District.~~

~~(75) San Diego Transit Buses; acquire about 85 low-emission buses for San Diego transit service in San Diego County. Thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). The lead applicant is the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board.~~

~~(76) Coaster Commuter Rail; acquire one new train set to expand commuter rail in San Diego County. Fourteen million dollars (\$14,000,000). The lead applicant is North County Transit District.~~

~~(77) Route 94; complete environmental studies to add capacity to Route 94 corridor, downtown San Diego to~~

1 ~~Route 125 in Lemon Grove in San Diego County. Twenty~~  
2 ~~million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
3 ~~department or San Diego Association of Governments.~~

4 ~~(78) East Village access; improve access to light rail~~  
5 ~~from new in-town East Village development in San Diego~~  
6 ~~County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead~~  
7 ~~applicant is the San Diego Metropolitan Transit~~  
8 ~~Development Board.~~

9 ~~(79) North County Light Rail; build new 20-mile light~~  
10 ~~rail line from Oceanside to Escondido in San Diego~~  
11 ~~County. Eighty million dollars (\$80,000,000). The lead~~  
12 ~~applicant is North County Transit District.~~

13 ~~(80) Mid Coast Light Rail; extend Old Town light rail~~  
14 ~~line 6 miles to Balboa Avenue in San Diego County. Ten~~  
15 ~~million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the San~~  
16 ~~Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board.~~

17 ~~(81) San Diego Ferry; acquire low-emission~~  
18 ~~high-speed ferryboat for new off-coast service between~~  
19 ~~San Diego and Oceanside in San Diego County. Five~~  
20 ~~million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the San~~  
21 ~~Diego Association of Governments.~~

22 ~~(82) Routes 5/805; reconstruct and widen freeway~~  
23 ~~interchange, Genesee Avenue to Del Mar Heights Road~~  
24 ~~in San Diego County. Twenty five million dollars~~  
25 ~~(\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the~~  
26 ~~San Diego Association of Governments.~~

27 ~~(83) Route 15; add high-tech managed lane on I-15~~  
28 ~~freeway north of San Diego (Stage 1) from Route 163 to~~  
29 ~~Route 78 in San Diego County. Seventy million dollars~~  
30 ~~(\$70,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the~~  
31 ~~San Diego Association of Governments.~~

32 ~~(84) Route 52; build four miles of new six-lane freeway~~  
33 ~~to Santee, Mission Gorge to Route 67 in San Diego~~  
34 ~~County. Forty-five million dollars (\$45,000,000). The lead~~  
35 ~~applicant is the department or the San Diego Association~~  
36 ~~of Governments.~~

37 ~~(85) Route 56; construct approximately five miles of~~  
38 ~~new freeway alignment between I-5 and I-15 from~~  
39 ~~Carmel Valley to Rancho Penasquitos in the City of San~~  
40 ~~Diego in San Diego County. Twenty five million dollars~~

~~(25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the San Diego Association of Governments.~~

~~(86) Route 905; build new six-lane freeway on Otay Mesa, Route 805 to Mexico Port of Entry in San Diego County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the San Diego Association of Governments.~~

~~(87) Routes 94/125; build two new freeway connector ramps at Route 94/125 in Lemon Grove in San Diego County. Sixty million dollars (\$60,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the San Diego Association of Governments.~~

~~(88) Route 5; realign freeway at Virginia Avenue, approaching San Ysidro Port of Entry to Mexico in San Diego County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the San Diego Association of Governments.~~

~~(89) Route 99; improve Shaw Avenue Interchange in northern Fresno in Fresno County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno County Governments.~~

~~(90) Route 99; widen freeway to six lanes, Kingsburg to Selma in Fresno County. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno County Governments.~~

~~(91) Route 180; build new expressway east of Clovis, Clovis Avenue to Temperance Avenue in Fresno County. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno County Governments.~~

~~(92) San Joaquin Corridor; improve track and signals along San Joaquin intercity rail line near Hanford in Kings County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~

~~(93) Route 180; complete environmental studies to extend Route 180 westward from Mendota to I-5 in Fresno County. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno County Governments.~~



~~(94) Route 43; widen to four-lane expressway from Kings County line to Route 99 in Selma in Fresno County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno County Governments.~~

~~(95) Route 41; add auxiliary lane/operational improvements and improve ramps at Friant Road Interchange in Fresno in Fresno County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno County Governments.~~

~~(96) Friant Road; widen to four lanes from Copper Avenue to Road 206 in Fresno County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the County of Fresno.~~

~~(97) Operational improvements on Shaw Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, Willow Avenue, and Barstow Avenue near California State University at Fresno in Fresno County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the Fresno County Transportation Authority. Of the amount authorized under this paragraph, the sum of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) shall be transferred to the California State University at Fresno for the purposes of funding preliminary plans, working drawings, or both of those, and related program management costs for the Fresno Events Center.~~

~~(98) Peach Avenue; widen to four-lane arterial and add pedestrian overcrossings for three schools in Fresno County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Fresno.~~

~~(99) San Joaquin Corridor; improve track and signals along San Joaquin intercity rail line in seven counties. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~

~~(100) San Joaquin Valley Emergency Clean Air Attainment Program; incentives for the reduction of emissions from heavy-duty diesel engines operating within the eight-county San Joaquin Valley region. Twenty five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.~~

1 ~~(101) Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District bus~~  
2 ~~fleet; acquisition of low emission buses. Three million~~  
3 ~~dollars (\$3,000,000). The lead applicant is the Santa Cruz~~  
4 ~~Metropolitan Transit District.~~

5 ~~(102) Route 101 access; State Street smart corridor~~  
6 ~~Advanced Traffic Corridor System (ATSC) technology in~~  
7 ~~Santa Barbara County. One million three hundred~~  
8 ~~thousand dollars (\$1,300,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
9 ~~City of Santa Barbara.~~

10 ~~(103) Route 99; improve interchange at Seventh~~  
11 ~~Standard Road, north of Bakersfield in Kern County.~~  
12 ~~Eight million dollars (\$8,000,000). The lead applicant is~~  
13 ~~the department or Kern Council of Governments.~~

14 ~~(104) Route 99; build seven miles of new six-lane~~  
15 ~~freeway south of Merced, Buchanan Hollow Road to~~  
16 ~~Healey Road in Merced County. Five million dollars~~  
17 ~~(\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the~~  
18 ~~Merced County Association of Governments.~~

19 ~~(105) Route 99; build two miles of new six-lane~~  
20 ~~freeway, Madera County line to Buchanan Hollow Road~~  
21 ~~in Merced County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The~~  
22 ~~lead applicant is the department or the Merced County~~  
23 ~~Association of Governments.~~

24 ~~(106) UC Merced access; build new arterial Campus~~  
25 ~~Parkway to new UC Merced campus in Merced County.~~  
26 ~~Twenty-three million dollars (\$23,000,000). The lead~~  
27 ~~applicant is the County of Merced.~~

28 ~~(107) Route 205; widen freeway to six lanes, Tracy to~~  
29 ~~I-5 in San Joaquin County. Twenty five million dollars~~  
30 ~~(\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the~~  
31 ~~San Joaquin Council of Governments.~~

32 ~~(108) Route 5; add northbound lane to freeway~~  
33 ~~through Mossdale "Y", Route 205 to Route 120 in San~~  
34 ~~Joaquin County. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The~~  
35 ~~lead applicant is the department or the San Joaquin~~  
36 ~~Council of Governments.~~

37 ~~(109) Route 132; build four miles of new four-lane~~  
38 ~~expressway in Modesto from Dakota Avenue to Route 99~~  
39 ~~and improve Route 99 Interchange in Stanislaus County.~~  
40 ~~Twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000). The lead applicant~~

1 is the department or the Stanislaus Council of  
2 Governments.

3 (110) Route 132; build 3.5 miles of new four-lane  
4 expressway from Route 33 to the San Joaquin county line  
5 in Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties. Two million  
6 dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the department  
7 or the Stanislaus Council of Governments.

8 (111) Route 198; build 10 miles of new four-lane  
9 expressway from Route 99 to Hanford in Kings and Tulare  
10 Counties. Fourteen million dollars (\$14,000,000). The  
11 lead applicant is the department or the Kings County  
12 Association of Governments.

13 (112) Jersey Avenue; widen from 170' Street to 18th  
14 Street in Kings County. One million five hundred  
15 thousand dollars (\$1,500,000). The lead applicant is Kings  
16 County.

17 (113) Route 46; widen to four lanes for 33 miles from  
18 Route 5 to San Luis Obispo County line in Kern County.  
19 Thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). The lead applicant is  
20 the department or the Kern Council of Governments.

21 (114) Route 65; add four passing lanes, intersection  
22 improvement, and conduct environmental studies for  
23 ultimate widening to four lanes from Route 99 in  
24 Bakersfield to Tulare County line in Kern County.  
25 Twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000). The lead applicant  
26 is the department or the Kern Council of Governments.

27 (115) South Line Light Rail; extend South Line three  
28 miles towards Elk Grove, from Meadowview Road to  
29 Calvine Road in Sacramento County. Seventy million  
30 dollars (\$70,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
31 Sacramento Regional Transit District.

32 (116) Route 80 Light Rail Corridor; double-track  
33 Route 80 light rail line for express service in Sacramento  
34 County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The  
35 lead applicant is the Sacramento Regional Transit  
36 District.

37 (117) Folsom Light Rail; extend Folsom light rail line  
38 six miles to Iron Point Road and add three stations in  
39 Sacramento County. Twenty million dollars

~~(\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the Sacramento Regional Transit District.~~

~~(118) Sacramento Emergency Clean Air/Transportation Plan (SECAT); incentive for the reduction of emissions from heavy-duty diesel engines operating within the Sacramento region. Fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000). The lead applicant is the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.~~

~~(119) Convert Sacramento Regional Transit bus fleet to low emission and provide Yolobus service by the Yolo County Transportation District; acquire approximately 50 replacement low-emission buses for service in Sacramento and Yolo Counties. Nineteen million dollars (\$19,000,000). The lead applicant is the Sacramento Area Council of Governments and the Yolo County Transportation District.~~

~~(120) Yuba Airport facility runway extension and improvements to reduce congestion. One million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000). The lead applicant is the County of Yuba.~~

~~(121) Metropolitan Bakersfield System Study; to reduce congestion in the City of Bakersfield. Three hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000). The lead applicant is the Kern County Council of Governments.~~

~~(122) Route 65; widening project from 7th Standard Road to Route 190 in Porterville. Three million five hundred thousand dollars (\$3,500,000). The lead applicant is the County of Tulare.~~

~~(123) Oceanside Transit Center; parking structure. One million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000). The lead applicant is the City of Oceanside.~~

~~(125) Route 57; environmental impact report and study for expansion project. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the Orange County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(126) Route 50/Watt Avenue interchange; widening of overcrossing and modifications to interchange. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the County of Sacramento.~~

1     ~~(127) Route 85/Route 87; interchange completion;~~  
2     ~~addition of two direct connectors for southbound Route~~  
3     ~~85 to northbound Route 87 and southbound Route 87 to~~  
4     ~~northbound Route 85. Three million five hundred~~  
5     ~~thousand dollars (\$3,500,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
6     ~~City of San Jose.~~  
7     ~~(128) Airport Road; reconstruction and intersection~~  
8     ~~improvement project. Three million dollars (\$3,000,000).~~  
9     ~~The lead applicant is the County of Shasta.~~  
10    ~~(129) Route 62; utility undergrounding project in~~  
11    ~~right of way of Route 62. Three million two hundred~~  
12    ~~thousand dollars (\$3,200,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
13    ~~Town of Yucca Valley.~~  
14    ~~(130) Route 22; connector and widening of~~  
15    ~~interchange with I 405 to reduce congestion. Three~~  
16    ~~million five hundred thousand dollars (\$3,500,000). The~~  
17    ~~lead applicant is the City of Garden Grove.~~  
18    ~~(131) Bear Valley Road; closure project and Kasota~~  
19    ~~Road, Route 18 frontage; redesign for safety purposes.~~  
20    ~~Eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000). The lead~~  
21    ~~applicant is the Town of Apple Valley.~~  
22    ~~(132) Fairway Drive; grade separation at Union~~  
23    ~~Pacific railroad project in San Gabriel Valley. Seven~~  
24    ~~million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
25    ~~County of Los Angeles.~~  
26    ~~(133) Feasibility studies for grade separation projects~~  
27    ~~for Union Pacific Railroad at Elk Grove Boulevard and~~  
28    ~~Bond Road. One hundred fifty thousand dollars~~  
29    ~~(\$150,000). The lead applicant is the City of Elk Grove.~~  
30    ~~(134) Route 50/Sunrise Boulevard; interchange~~  
31    ~~modifications. Three million dollars (\$3,000,000). The~~  
32    ~~lead applicant is the County of Sacramento.~~  
33    ~~(135) Route 99/Sheldon Road; interchange project;~~  
34    ~~reconstruction and expansion. Three million dollars~~  
35    ~~(\$3,000,000). The lead applicant is the County of~~  
36    ~~Sacramento.~~  
37    ~~(136) Avenue S; widening between Route 14 and~~  
38    ~~Route 138. Three million five hundred thousand dollars~~  
39    ~~(\$3,500,000). The lead applicant is the City of Palmdale.~~

1     ~~(137) Fox Field Industrial Corridor; gateway~~  
2 ~~improvements; widening of Route 14/Avenue H~~  
3 ~~overcrossing. Five million five hundred thousand dollars~~  
4 ~~(\$5,500,000). The lead applicant is the City of Lancaster.~~

5     ~~(138) Cross Valley Rail; upgrade track from Visalia to~~  
6 ~~Huron. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead~~  
7 ~~applicant is the Cross Valley Rail Corridor Joint Powers~~  
8 ~~Authority.~~

9     ~~(139) Balboa Park BART Station; phase I expansion.~~  
10 ~~Six million dollars (\$6,000,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
11 ~~San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.~~

12     ~~(140) City of Goshen; overpass for Route 99. One~~  
13 ~~million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000). The~~  
14 ~~lead applicant is the department.~~

15     ~~(141) Union City; pedestrian bridge over Union~~  
16 ~~Pacific rail lines. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The~~  
17 ~~lead applicant is the City of Union City.~~

18     ~~(142) West Hollywood; repair, maintenance, and~~  
19 ~~mitigation of Santa Monica Boulevard. Three million five~~  
20 ~~hundred thousand dollars (\$3,500,000). The lead~~  
21 ~~applicant is the City of West Hollywood.~~

22     ~~(143) Capital Corridor; expand intercity rail service.~~  
23 ~~One million nine hundred thousand dollars (\$1,900,000).~~  
24 ~~The lead applicant is the Capital Corridor Joint Powers~~  
25 ~~Authority.~~

26     ~~(144) Seismic retrofit of the national landmark Golden~~  
27 ~~Gate Bridge. Fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000). The lead~~  
28 ~~applicant is the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and~~  
29 ~~Transportation District.~~

30     ~~(145) Construction of a new siding in Sun Valley~~  
31 ~~between Sheldon Street and Sunland Boulevard. Six~~  
32 ~~million five hundred thousand dollars (\$6,500,000). The~~  
33 ~~lead applicant is the Southern California Regional Rail~~  
34 ~~Authority.~~

35     ~~(146) Construction of Palm Drive Interchange. Ten~~  
36 ~~million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
37 ~~Coachella Valley Association of Governments.~~

38     ~~(147) Project development work for the~~  
39 ~~reconstruction of the I-8/Imperial Avenue interchange.~~

1 ~~Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is~~  
2 ~~the Imperial Valley Association of Governments.~~  
3 ~~(148) Route 98; widening of 8 miles between Route 111~~  
4 ~~and Route 7 from two lanes to 4 lanes. Ten million dollars~~  
5 ~~(\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~  
6 ~~(149) Purchase of low-emission buses for express~~  
7 ~~service on Route 17. Three million seven hundred fifty~~  
8 ~~thousand dollars (\$3,750,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
9 ~~Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.~~  
10 ~~(150) Renovation or rehabilitation of Santa Cruz~~  
11 ~~Metro Center. One million dollars (\$1,000,000). The lead~~  
12 ~~applicant is the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.~~  
13 ~~(151) Purchase of 5 alternative fuel buses for the~~  
14 ~~Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System. One million one~~  
15 ~~hundred thousand dollars (\$1,100,000). The lead~~  
16 ~~applicant is the Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System.~~  
17 ~~(152) Pasadena Blue Line transit-oriented mixed-use~~  
18 ~~development. One million five hundred thousand dollars~~  
19 ~~(\$1,500,000). The lead applicant is the Los Angeles~~  
20 ~~County Metropolitan Transportation Authority of the~~  
21 ~~City of South Pasadena.~~  
22 ~~(153) Pasadena Blue Line utility relocation. Five~~  
23 ~~hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$550,000). The lead~~  
24 ~~applicant is the City of South Pasadena.~~  
25 ~~(154) Route 135/I-5 interchange study. One hundred~~  
26 ~~thousand dollars (\$100,000). The lead applicant is the~~  
27 ~~department.~~  
28 ~~(155) City of Chula Vista; (A) at its option, to acquire~~  
29 ~~right of way, build, and operate a 10-mile limited access~~  
30 ~~toll facility from San Miguel Road to Otay Mesa Road.~~  
31 ~~Eight million six hundred thousand dollars (\$8,600,000).~~  
32 ~~(B) Of the amount specified, five hundred thousand~~  
33 ~~dollars (\$500,000) shall be immediately available to the~~  
34 ~~City of Chula Vista for the purpose of conducting a due~~  
35 ~~diligence review, including an independent appraisal of~~  
36 ~~the feasibility of acquisition by a public agency of the~~  
37 ~~Route 125 franchise agreement authorized under Section~~  
38 ~~143 of the Streets and Highways Code. The lead applicant~~  
39 ~~is the City of Chula Vista.~~



~~(156) Seismic retrofit and core segment improvements for the Bay Area Rapid Transit system. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.~~

~~(157) Route 12; Congestion relief improvements from Route 29 to I-80 through Jamison Canyon. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.~~

~~(158) Remodel the intersection of Olympic Boulevard and Lemon Street and install a new traffic signal. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Los Angeles.~~

~~(159) Route 101; redesign and construction of Steele Lane interchange. Six million dollars (\$6,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Sonoma County Transportation Authority.~~

~~(b) As used in this section "route" is a state highway route as identified in Article 3 (commencing with Section 300) of Chapter 2 of Division 1 of the Streets and Highways Code.~~

*SEC. 5. Section 14556.40 of the Government Code, as added by Section 6 of Chapter 91 of the Statutes of 2000, is amended to read:*

14556.40. (a) The following projects are eligible for grants from the fund for the purposes and amounts specified:

(1) BART to San Jose; extend BART from Fremont to Downtown San Jose in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties. Seven hundred twenty-five million dollars (\$725,000,000). The lead applicant is the ~~Bay Area Rapid Transit District~~ Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

(2) Fremont-South Bay Commuter Rail; acquire rail line and start commuter rail service between Fremont and San Jose in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties. Thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000). The lead applicant is the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

(3) Route 101; widen freeway from four to eight lanes south of San Jose, ~~Bernal~~ Bernal Road to Burnett Avenue

1 in Santa Clara County. Twenty-five million dollars  
2 (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
3 Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

4 (4) Route 680; add northbound HOV lane over Sunol  
5 Grade, Milpitas to Route 84 in Santa Clara and Alameda  
6 Counties. Sixty million dollars (\$60,000,000). The lead  
7 applicant is the department or the Alameda County  
8 Congestion Management Agency.

9 (5) Route 101; add northbound lane to freeway  
10 through San Jose, Route 87 to Trimble Road in Santa Clara  
11 County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead  
12 applicant is the department or the Santa Clara Valley  
13 Transportation Authority.

14 (6) Route 262; major investment study for cross  
15 connector freeway, Route 680 to Route 880 near Warm  
16 Springs in Santa Clara County. One million dollars  
17 (\$1,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
18 ~~Metropolitan Transportation Commission~~ Santa Clara  
19 Valley Transportation Authority.

20 (7) CalTrain; expand service to Gilroy; improve  
21 parking, stations, and platforms along UPRR line in Santa  
22 Clara County. Fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000). The  
23 lead applicant is Santa Clara Valley Transportation  
24 Authority.

25 (8) Route 880; reconstruct Coleman Avenue  
26 Interchange near San Jose Airport in Santa Clara County.  
27 Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
28 department or the Santa Clara Valley Transportation  
29 Authority.

30 (9) Capitol Corridor; improve intercity rail line  
31 between Oakland and San Jose, and at Jack London  
32 Square and Emeryville stations in Alameda and Santa  
33 Clara Counties. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000).  
34 The lead applicant is the department or the Capitol  
35 Corridor Joint Powers Authority.

36 (10) Regional Express Bus; acquire low-emission buses  
37 for new express service on HOV lanes regionwide. In nine  
38 counties. Forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). The lead  
39 applicant is the Metropolitan Transportation  
40 Commission.

(11) San Francisco Bay Southern Crossing; complete feasibility and financial studies for new San Francisco Bay crossing (new bridge, HOV/Transit bridge, *terminal connection*, or second BART tube) in Alameda and San Francisco or San Mateo Counties. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

(12) Bay Area Transit Connectivity; complete studies of, and fund related improvements for, the I-580 Livermore Corridor; *the Hercules Rail Station and related improvements*, West Contra Costa County and Route 4 Corridors in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Seventeen million dollars (\$17,000,000). ~~The lead applicant for the I-580 study is the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency; and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority is the lead applicant for the West Contra Costa and Route 4 studies~~ *Of the amount specified, seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) shall be made available for the Route 4 Corridor study and improvements, seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) shall be made available for the I-580 Corridor study and improvements, and three million dollars (\$3,000,000) shall be made available for the Hercules Rail Station study and improvements. The lead applicant for the Hercules Rail Station and related improvements in west Contra Costa County is the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority. The lead applicants, for the I-580 Livermore Study and improvements are the Alameda County Congestion Management Authority and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District. The lead applicants for the Route 4 Corridor Study and improvements are the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.*

(13) CalTrain Peninsula Corridor; acquire rolling stock, add passing tracks, and construct pedestrian access structure at stations between San Francisco and San Jose in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties. One hundred twenty-seven million dollars

1 (\$127,000,000). The lead applicant is the Peninsula Joint  
2 Powers Board.

3 (14) CalTrain; extension to Salinas in Monterey  
4 County. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead  
5 applicant is the Transportation Agency for Monterey  
6 County.

7 (15) Route 24; Caldecott Tunnel; add fourth bore  
8 tunnel with additional lanes in Alameda and Contra Costa  
9 Counties. Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead  
10 applicant is the department or the Metropolitan  
11 Transportation Commission.

12 (16) Route 4; construct one or more phases of  
13 improvements to widen freeway to eight lanes from  
14 Railroad through Loveridge Road, including two  
15 high-occupancy vehicle lanes, and to six or more lanes  
16 from east of Loveridge Road through Hillcrest.  
17 Thirty-nine million dollars (\$39,000,000). The lead  
18 applicant is the Contra Costa Transportation Authority.

19 (17) Route 101; add reversible HOV lane through San  
20 Rafael, Sir Francis Drake Boulevard to North San Pedro  
21 Road in Marin County. Fifteen million dollars  
22 (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
23 Marin Congestion Management Agency.

24 (18) Route 101; widen eight miles of freeway to six  
25 lanes, Novato to Petaluma (Novato Narrows) in Marin  
26 and Sonoma Counties. Twenty-one million dollars  
27 (\$21,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
28 Sonoma County Transportation Authority.

29 (19) Bay Area Water Transit Authority; establish a  
30 regional water transit system beginning with Treasure  
31 Island in the City and County of San Francisco. Two  
32 million dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the Bay  
33 Area Water Transit Authority.

34 (20) San Francisco Muni Third Street Light Rail;  
35 extend Third Street line to Chinatown (tunnel) in the  
36 City and County of San Francisco. One hundred forty  
37 million dollars (\$140,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
38 *San Francisco* Municipal Transportation Agency.

39 (21) San Francisco Muni Ocean Avenue Light Rail;  
40 reconstruct Ocean Avenue light rail line to Route 1 near

1 California State University, San Francisco, in the City and  
2 County of San Francisco. Seven million dollars  
3 (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the *San Francisco*  
4 *Municipal Transportation Agency*.

5 (22) Route 101; environmental study for  
6 reconstruction of Doyle Drive, from Lombard  
7 St./Richardson Avenue to Route 1 Interchange in City  
8 and County of San Francisco. Fifteen million dollars  
9 (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
10 San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

11 (23) CalTrain Peninsula Corridor; complete grade  
12 separations at Poplar Avenue in ~~(Burlingame—San~~  
13 *Mateo*), 25th Avenue *or vicinity* (San Mateo), and Linden  
14 Avenue (South San Francisco) in San Mateo County.  
15 Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant  
16 is the San Mateo County Transportation Authority.

17 (24) Vallejo Baylink Ferry; acquire low-emission  
18 ferryboats to expand Baylink Vallejo-San Francisco  
19 service in Solano County. Five million dollars  
20 (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Vallejo.

21 (25) I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange in Fairfield in  
22 Solano County; 12 interchange complex in seven stages  
23 (Stage 1). Thirteen million dollars (\$13,000,000). The lead  
24 applicant is the department or the Solano Transportation  
25 Authority.

26 (26) ACE Commuter Rail; add siding on UPRR line in  
27 Livermore Valley in Alameda County. One million  
28 dollars (\$1,000,000). The lead applicant is the ~~San Joaquin~~  
29 ~~Regional—Rail~~ *Alameda County Congestion Management*  
30 *Authority*.

31 (27) Vasco Road Safety and Transit Enhancement  
32 Project in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Eleven  
33 million dollars (\$11,000,000). The lead applicant is  
34 Alameda County Congestion Management Authority.

35 (28) Parking Structure at Transit Village at Richmond  
36 BART Station in Contra Costa County. Five million  
37 dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the ~~Bay Area~~  
38 ~~Rapid Transit District~~ *City of Richmond*.

39 (29) AC Transit; buy two fuel cell buses and fueling  
40 facility for demonstration project in Alameda and Contra

1 Costa Counties. Eight million dollars (\$8,000,000). The  
2 lead applicant is the Alameda Contra Costa Transit  
3 District.

4 (30) Implementation of commuter rail passenger  
5 service from Cloverdale south to San Rafael and Larkspur  
6 in Marin and Sonoma Counties. Thirty-seven million  
7 dollars (\$37,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
8 Sonoma-Marín Area Transit Authority.

9 (31) Route 580; construct eastbound and westbound  
10 HOV lanes from Tassajara Road/Santa Rita Road to Vasco  
11 Road in Alameda County. Twenty-five million dollars  
12 (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
13 Alameda County Congestion Management Authority.

14 (32) North Coast Railroad; repair and upgrade track to  
15 meet Class II (freight) standards in Napa, Sonoma,  
16 Marin, Mendocino and Humboldt Counties. Sixty million  
17 dollars (\$60,000,000). The lead applicant is the North  
18 Coast Rail Authority. *Except for the amounts specified in*  
19 *paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) and subdivision (b) of*  
20 *Section 14456.50, no part of the specified amount may be*  
21 *made available to the authority until it has made a full*  
22 *accounting to the commission demonstrating that the*  
23 *expenditure of funds provided to the authority in the*  
24 *Budget Act of 2000 (Chapter 52 of the Statutes of 2000)*  
25 *was consistent with the limitations placed on those funds*  
26 *in that Budget Act.*

27 (33) Bus Transit; acquire low-emission buses for Los  
28 Angeles County MTA bus transit service. One hundred  
29 fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000). The lead applicant is  
30 the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
31 Authority.

32 (34) Blue Line to Los Angeles; new rail line Pasadena  
33 to Los Angeles in Los Angeles County. Forty million  
34 dollars (\$40,000,000). The lead applicant is the Pasadena  
35 Metro Blue Line Construction Authority.

36 (35) Pacific Surfliner; triple track intercity rail line  
37 within Los Angeles County and add run-through-tracks  
38 through Los Angeles Union Station in Los Angeles  
39 County. One hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000). The  
40 lead applicant is the department.

1 (36) Los Angeles Eastside Transit Extension; build  
2 new light rail line in East Los Angeles, from Union Station  
3 to Atlantic via 1st Street to Lorena in Los Angeles County.  
4 Two hundred thirty-six million dollars (\$236,000,000).  
5 The lead applicant is the Los Angeles County  
6 Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

7 (37) Los Angeles Mid-City Transit Improvements;  
8 build Bus Rapid Transit system or Light Rail Transit in  
9 Mid-City/Westside/Exposition Corridors in Los Angeles  
10 County. Two hundred fifty-six million dollars  
11 (\$256,000,000). The lead applicant is the Los Angeles  
12 County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

13 (38) Los Angeles-San Fernando Valley Transit  
14 Extension; (A) build an East-West Bus Rapid Transit  
15 system in the Burbank-Chandler corridor, from North  
16 Hollywood to Warner Center. One hundred forty-five  
17 million dollars (\$145,000,000). (B) Build a North-South  
18 corridor bus transit project that interfaces with the  
19 foregoing East-West Burbank-Chandler corridor project  
20 and with the Ventura Boulevard Rapid Bus project. One  
21 hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000). The lead  
22 applicant for both extension projects is the Los Angeles  
23 County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

24 (39) Route 405; add northbound HOV lane over  
25 Sepulveda Pass, Route 10 to Route 101 in Los Angeles  
26 County. Ninety million dollars (\$90,000,000). The lead  
27 applicant is the department or the Los Angeles County  
28 Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

29 (40) Route 10; add HOV lanes on San Bernardino  
30 Freeway over Kellogg Hill, near Pomona, Route 605 to  
31 Route 57 in Los Angeles County. Ninety million dollars  
32 (\$90,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
33 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
34 Authority.

35 (41) Route 5; add HOV lanes on Golden State Freeway  
36 through San Fernando Valley, Route 170 (Hollywood  
37 Freeway) to Route 14 (Antelope Valley Freeway) in Los  
38 Angeles County. Fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000). The  
39 lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles  
40 County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.



1 (42) Route 5; widen Santa Ana Freeway to 10 lanes  
2 (two HOV + two mixed flow), Orange County line to  
3 Route 710, with related major arterial improvements, in  
4 Los Angeles County. One hundred twenty-five million  
5 dollars (\$125,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
6 department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
7 Transportation Authority.

8 (43) Route 5; improve Carmenita Road Interchange in  
9 Norwalk in Los Angeles County. Seventy-one million  
10 dollars (\$71,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
11 department or the Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
12 Transportation Authority.

13 (44) Route 47 (Terminal Island Freeway); construct  
14 interchange at Ocean Boulevard Overpass in the City of  
15 Long Beach in Los Angeles County. Eighteen million four  
16 hundred thousand dollars (\$18,400,000). The lead  
17 applicant is the Port of Long Beach.

18 (45) Route 710; complete Gateway Corridor Study,  
19 Los Angeles/Long Beach ports to Route 5 in Los Angeles  
20 County. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead  
21 applicant is the department.

22 (46) Route 1; reconstruct intersection at Route 107 in  
23 Torrance in Los Angeles County. Two million dollars  
24 (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
25 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
26 Authority.

27 (47) Route 101; California Street off-ramp in Ventura  
28 County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead  
29 applicant is the department or the ~~Ventura County~~  
30 ~~Transportation Commission~~ *City of San Buenaventura*.

31 (48) Route 101; corridor analysis and PSR to improve  
32 corridor from Route 170 (North Hollywood Freeway) to  
33 Route 23 in Thousand Oaks (Ventura County) in Los  
34 Angeles and Ventura Counties. Three million dollars  
35 (\$3,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.

36 (49) Hollywood Intermodal Transportation Center;  
37 intermodal facility at Highland Avenue and Hawthorn  
38 Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. Ten million dollars  
39 (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of Los  
40 Angeles.

1 (50) Route 71; complete three miles of six-lane  
2 freeway through Pomona, from Route 10 to Route 60 in  
3 Los Angeles County. Thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000).  
4 The lead applicant is the department or the Los Angeles  
5 County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

6 (51) Route 101/405; add auxiliary lane and widen ramp  
7 through freeway interchange in Sherman Oaks in Los  
8 Angeles County. Twenty-one million dollars  
9 (\$21,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
10 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
11 Authority.

12 (52) Route 405; add HOV and auxiliary lanes for 1 mile  
13 in West Los Angeles, from Waterford Avenue to Route 10  
14 in Los Angeles County. Twenty-five million dollars  
15 (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
16 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
17 Authority.

18 (53) Automated Signal Corridors (ATSAC); improve  
19 479 automated signals in Victory/Ventura Corridor, and  
20 add 76 new automated signals in Sepulveda Boulevard  
21 and Route 118 Corridors in Los Angeles County. Sixteen  
22 million dollars (\$16,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
23 City of Los Angeles.

24 (54) Alameda Corridor East; build grade separations  
25 on ~~BNSF and UPRR Burlington Northern-Santa Fe and~~  
26 ~~Union Pacific Railroad~~ lines, downtown Los Angeles to  
27 Los Angeles County line in Los Angeles County. One  
28 hundred fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000). The lead  
29 applicant is the San Gabriel Valley Council of  
30 Governments.

31 (55) Alameda Corridor East; build grade separations  
32 on ~~UPRR line, Los Angeles County line to Colton~~  
33 ~~Burlington Northern-Santa Fe and Union Pacific~~  
34 ~~Railroad~~ lines, with rail-to-rail separation at Colton ~~in~~  
35 ~~through~~ San Bernardino County. Ninety-five million  
36 dollars (\$95,000,000). The lead applicant is the San  
37 ~~Bernadino~~ Bernardino Associated Governments.

38 (56) Metrolink; track and signal improvements on  
39 Metrolink; San Bernardino line in San Bernardino  
40 County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead

1 applicant is the Southern California Regional Rail  
2 Authority.

3 (57) Route 215; add HOV lanes through downtown  
4 San Bernardino, Route 10 to Route 30 in San Bernardino  
5 County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The  
6 lead applicant is the department or the San Bernardino  
7 County Transportation Commission.

8 (58) Route 10; widen freeway to eight-lanes through  
9 Redlands, Route 30 to Ford Street in San Bernardino  
10 County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead  
11 applicant is the department or the San Bernardino  
12 County Transportation Commission.

13 (59) Route 10; Live Oak Canyon Interchange,  
14 *including, but not limited to, the 14th Street bridge over*  
15 *Wilson Creek*, in the City of Yucaipa in San Bernardino  
16 County. Eleven million dollars (\$11,000,000). The lead  
17 applicant is the department or the San Bernardino  
18 County Transportation Commission.

19 (60) Route 15; southbound truck climbing lane at two  
20 locations in San Bernardino County. Ten million dollars  
21 (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
22 San Bernardino County Transportation Commission.

23 (61) Route 10; reconstruct Apache Trail Interchange  
24 east of Banning in Riverside County. Thirty million  
25 dollars (\$30,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
26 department or the Riverside County Transportation  
27 Commission.

28 (62) Route 91; add HOV lanes through downtown  
29 Riverside, Mary Street to Route 60/215 junction in  
30 Riverside County. Forty million dollars (\$40,000,000).  
31 The lead applicant is the department or the Riverside  
32 County Transportation Commission.

33 (63) Route 60; add seven miles of HOV lanes west of  
34 Riverside, Route 15 to Valley Way in Riverside County.  
35 Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead  
36 applicant is the department or the Riverside County  
37 Transportation Commission.

38 (64) Route 91; improve the Green River Interchange  
39 and add auxiliary lane and connector ramp east of the  
40 Green River Interchange to northbound Route 71 in



1 Riverside County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The  
2 lead applicant is the department or the Riverside County  
3 Transportation Commission.

4 (70) Route 22; add HOV lanes on Garden Grove  
5 Freeway, Route I-405 to Route 55 in Orange County. Two  
6 hundred six million five hundred thousand dollars  
7 (\$206,500,000). The lead applicant is the department or  
8 the Orange County Transportation Authority.

9 (73) Alameda Corridor East; (Orangethorpe  
10 Corridor) build grade separations on ~~BNSF~~—*Burlington*  
11 *Northern-Santa Fe* line, Los Angeles County line through  
12 Santa Ana Canyon in Orange County. Twenty-eight  
13 million dollars (\$28,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
14 Orange County Transportation Authority.

15 (74) Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line  
16 within San Diego County, add maintenance yard in San  
17 Diego County. Forty-seven million dollars (\$47,000,000).  
18 The lead applicant is the department or North Coast  
19 Transit District.

20 (75) San Diego Transit Buses; acquire about 85  
21 low-emission buses for San Diego transit service in San  
22 Diego County. Thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). The  
23 lead applicant is the San Diego Metropolitan Transit  
24 Development Board.

25 (76) Coaster Commuter Rail; acquire one new train  
26 set to expand commuter rail in San Diego County.  
27 Fourteen million dollars (\$14,000,000). The lead  
28 applicant is North County Transit District.

29 (77) Route 94; complete environmental studies to add  
30 capacity to Route 94 corridor, downtown San Diego to  
31 Route 125 in Lemon Grove in San Diego County. Twenty  
32 million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
33 department or San Diego Association of Governments.

34 (78) East Village access; improve access to light rail  
35 from new in-town East Village development in San Diego  
36 County. Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead  
37 applicant is the San Diego Metropolitan Transit  
38 Development Board.

39 (79) North County Light Rail; build new 20-mile light  
40 rail line from Oceanside to Escondido in San Diego

1 County. Eighty million dollars (\$80,000,000). The lead  
2 applicant is North County Transit District.

3 (80) Mid-Coast Light Rail; extend Old Town light rail  
4 line 6 miles to Balboa Avenue in San Diego County. Ten  
5 million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the San  
6 Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board.

7 (81) San Diego Ferry; acquire low-emission  
8 high-speed ferryboat for new off-coast service between  
9 San Diego and Oceanside in San Diego County. Five  
10 million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the *Port*  
11 *of San Diego-Association of Governments*.

12 (82) Routes 5/805; reconstruct and widen freeway  
13 interchange, Genesee Avenue to Del Mar Heights Road  
14 in San Diego County. Twenty-five million dollars  
15 (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
16 San Diego Association of Governments.

17 (83) Route 15; add high-tech managed lane on I-15  
18 freeway north of San Diego (Stage 1) from Route 163 to  
19 Route 78 in San Diego County. Seventy million dollars  
20 (\$70,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
21 San Diego Association of Governments.

22 (84) Route 52; build four miles of new six-lane freeway  
23 to Santee, Mission Gorge to Route 67 in San Diego  
24 County. Forty-five million dollars (\$45,000,000). The lead  
25 applicant is the department or the San Diego Association  
26 of Governments.

27 (85) Route 56; construct approximately five miles of  
28 new freeway alignment between I-5 and I-15 from  
29 Carmel Valley to Rancho Penasquitos in the City of San  
30 Diego in San Diego County. Twenty-five million dollars  
31 (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
32 San Diego Association of Governments.

33 (86) Route 905; build new six-lane freeway on Otay  
34 Mesa, Route 805 to Mexico Port of Entry in San Diego  
35 County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The  
36 lead applicant is the department or the San Diego  
37 Association of Governments.

38 (87) Routes 94/125; build two new freeway connector  
39 ramps at Route 94/125 in Lemon Grove in San Diego  
40 County. Sixty million dollars (\$60,000,000). The lead

1 applicant is the department or the San Diego Association  
2 of Governments.

3 (88) Route 5; realign freeway at Virginia Avenue,  
4 approaching San Ysidro Port of Entry to Mexico in San  
5 Diego County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead  
6 applicant is the department or the San Diego Association  
7 of Governments.

8 (89) Route 99; improve Shaw Avenue Interchange in  
9 northern Fresno in Fresno County. Five million dollars  
10 (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
11 Council of Fresno County Governments.

12 (90) Route 99; widen freeway to six lanes, Kingsburg  
13 to Selma in Fresno County. Twenty million dollars  
14 (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
15 Council of Fresno County Governments.

16 (91) Route 180; build new expressway east of Clovis,  
17 Clovis Avenue to Temperance Avenue in Fresno County.  
18 Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant  
19 is the department or the Council of Fresno County  
20 Governments.

21 (92) San Joaquin Corridor; improve track and signals  
22 along San Joaquin intercity rail line near Hanford in Kings  
23 County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead  
24 applicant is the department.

25 (93) Route 180; complete environmental studies to  
26 extend Route 180 westward from Mendota to I-5 in  
27 Fresno County. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The  
28 lead applicant is the department or the Council of Fresno  
29 County Governments.

30 (94) Route 43; widen to four-lane expressway from  
31 Kings County line to Route 99 in Selma in Fresno County.  
32 Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
33 department or the Council of Fresno County  
34 Governments.

35 (95) Route 41; add auxiliary lane/operational  
36 improvements and improve ramps at Friant Road  
37 Interchange in Fresno in Fresno County. Ten million  
38 dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
39 department or the Council of Fresno County  
40 Governments.

1 (96) Friant Road; widen to four lanes from Copper  
2 Avenue to Road 206 in Fresno County. Ten million dollars  
3 (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the County of Fresno.

4 (97) Operational improvements on Shaw Avenue,  
5 Chestnut Avenue, Willow Avenue, and Barstow Avenue  
6 near California State University at Fresno in Fresno  
7 County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead  
8 applicant is the *California State University at Fresno*  
9 ~~County Transportation Authority~~. Of the amount  
10 authorized under this paragraph, the sum of two million  
11 dollars (\$2,000,000) shall be transferred to the California  
12 State University at Fresno for the purposes of funding  
13 preliminary plans, working drawings, or both of those,  
14 and related program management costs for the Fresno  
15 Events Center.

16 (98) Peach Avenue; widen to four-lane arterial and  
17 add pedestrian overcrossings for three schools in Fresno  
18 County. Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead  
19 applicant is the City of Fresno.

20 (99) San Joaquin Corridor; improve track and signals  
21 along San Joaquin intercity rail line in seven counties.  
22 Fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). The lead applicant  
23 is the department.

24 (100) San Joaquin Valley Emergency Clean Air  
25 Attainment Program; incentives for the reduction of  
26 emissions from heavy-duty diesel engines operating  
27 within the eight-county San Joaquin Valley region.  
28 Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The lead  
29 applicant is the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution  
30 Control District.

31 (101) Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District bus  
32 fleet; acquisition of low-emission buses. Three million  
33 dollars (\$3,000,000). The lead applicant is the Santa Cruz  
34 Metropolitan Transit District.

35 (102) Route 101 access; State Street smart corridor  
36 Advanced Traffic Corridor System (ATSC) technology in  
37 Santa Barbara County. One million three hundred  
38 thousand dollars (\$1,300,000). The lead applicant is the  
39 City of Santa Barbara.



1 (103) Route 99; improve interchange at Seventh  
2 Standard Road, north of Bakersfield in Kern County.  
3 Eight million dollars (\$8,000,000). The lead applicant is  
4 the department or Kern Council of Governments.

5 (104) Route 99; build seven miles of new six-lane  
6 freeway south of Merced, Buchanan Hollow Road to  
7 Healey Road in Merced County. Five million dollars  
8 (\$5,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
9 Merced County Association of Governments.

10 (105) Route 99; build two miles of new six-lane  
11 freeway, Madera County line to Buchanan Hollow Road  
12 in Merced County. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The  
13 lead applicant is the department or the Merced County  
14 Association of Governments.

15 ~~(106) UC Merced access Campus Parkway; build new~~  
16 ~~arterial Campus Parkway to new UC Merced campus in~~  
17 ~~Merced County from Route 99 to Bellevue Road.~~  
18 ~~Twenty-three million dollars (\$23,000,000). The lead~~  
19 ~~applicant is the County of Merced.~~

20 (107) Route 205; widen freeway to six lanes, Tracy to  
21 I-5 in San Joaquin County. Twenty-five million dollars  
22 (\$25,000,000). The lead applicant is the department or the  
23 San Joaquin Council of Governments.

24 (108) Route 5; add northbound lane to freeway  
25 through Mossdale "Y", Route 205 to Route 120 in San  
26 Joaquin County. Seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). The  
27 lead applicant is the department or the San Joaquin  
28 Council of Governments.

29 (109) Route 132; build four miles of new four-lane  
30 expressway in Modesto from Dakota Avenue to Route 99  
31 and improve Route 99 Interchange in Stanislaus County.  
32 Twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000). The lead applicant  
33 is the department or the Stanislaus Council of  
34 Governments.

35 (110) Route 132; build 3.5 miles of new four-lane  
36 expressway from Route 33 to the San Joaquin county line  
37 in Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties. Two million  
38 dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the department  
39 or the Stanislaus Council of Governments.

1 (111) Route 198; build 10 miles of new four-lane  
2 expressway from Route 99 to Hanford in Kings and Tulare  
3 Counties. Fourteen million dollars (\$14,000,000). The  
4 lead applicant is the department or the Kings County  
5 Association of Governments.

6 (112) Jersey Avenue; widen from 470<sup>2</sup> 17th Street to  
7 18th Street in Kings County. One million five hundred  
8 thousand dollars (\$1,500,000). The lead applicant is Kings  
9 County.

10 (113) Route 46; widen to four lanes for 33 miles from  
11 Route 5 to San Luis Obispo County line in Kern County.  
12 Thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). The lead applicant is  
13 the department or the Kern Council of Governments.

14 (114) Route 65; add four passing lanes, intersection  
15 improvement, and conduct environmental studies for  
16 ultimate widening to four lanes from Route 99 in  
17 Bakersfield to Tulare County line in Kern County.  
18 Twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000). The lead applicant  
19 is the department or the Kern Council of Governments.

20 (115) South Line Light Rail; extend South Line three  
21 miles towards Elk Grove, from Meadowview Road to  
22 Calvine Road in Sacramento County. Seventy million  
23 dollars (\$70,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
24 Sacramento Regional Transit District.

25 (116) Route 80 Light Rail Corridor; double-track  
26 Route 80 light rail line for express service in Sacramento  
27 County. Twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). The  
28 lead applicant is the Sacramento Regional Transit  
29 District.

30 (117) Folsom Light Rail; extend ~~Folsom~~ light rail line  
31 ~~six miles to Iron Point Road and add three tracks from 7th~~  
32 ~~Street and K Street to the Amtrak Depot in downtown~~  
33 ~~Sacramento, and extend Folsom light rail from Mather~~  
34 ~~Field Station to downtown Folsom. Add a new vehicle~~  
35 ~~storage and maintenance facility in the area between the~~  
36 ~~Sunrise Boulevard and Hazel Avenue~~ stations in  
37 Sacramento County. Twenty million dollars  
38 (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant is the Sacramento  
39 Regional Transit District.

1 (118) Sacramento Emergency Clean  
2 Air/Transportation Plan (SECAT); incentive for the  
3 reduction of emissions from heavy-duty diesel engines  
4 operating within the Sacramento region. Fifty million  
5 dollars (\$50,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
6 Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

7 (119) Convert Sacramento Regional Transit bus fleet  
8 to low emission *and provide Yolo bus service by the Yolo*  
9 *County Transportation District*; acquire approximately  
10 50 replacement low-emission buses for service in  
11 Sacramento and Yolo Counties. Nineteen million dollars  
12 (\$19,000,000). The lead ~~applicant is~~ *applicants are the*  
13 *Sacramento Regional Transit District*, the Sacramento  
14 Area Council of Governments, and the Yolo Bus  
15 Authority.

16 (121) Metropolitan Bakersfield System Study; to  
17 reduce congestion in the City of Bakersfield. Three  
18 hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000). The lead  
19 applicant is the Kern County Council of Governments.

20 (122) Route 65; widening project from 7th Standard  
21 Road to Route 190 in Porterville. Three million five  
22 hundred thousand dollars (\$3,500,000). The lead  
23 applicant is the County of Tulare.

24 (123) Oceanside Transit Center; parking structure.  
25 One million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000).  
26 The lead applicant is the City of Oceanside.

27 (126) Route 50/Watt Avenue interchange; widening  
28 of overcrossing and modifications to interchange. Seven  
29 million dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
30 County of Sacramento.

31 (127) Route 85/Route 87; interchange completion;  
32 addition of two direct connectors for southbound Route  
33 85 to northbound Route 87 and southbound Route 87 to  
34 northbound Route 85. Three million five hundred  
35 thousand dollars (\$3,500,000). The lead applicant is the  
36 City of San Jose.

37 (128) Airport Road; reconstruction and intersection  
38 improvement project. Three million dollars (\$3,000,000).  
39 The lead applicant is the County of Shasta.

1 (129) Route 62; utility undergrounding project in  
2 right-of-way of Route 62. Three million two hundred  
3 thousand dollars (\$3,200,000). The lead applicant is the  
4 Town of Yucca Valley.

5 (133) Feasibility studies for grade separation projects  
6 for Union Pacific Railroad at Elk Grove Boulevard and  
7 Bond Road. One hundred fifty thousand dollars  
8 (\$150,000). The lead applicant is the City of Elk Grove.

9 (134) Route 50/Sunrise Boulevard; interchange  
10 modifications. Three million dollars (\$3,000,000). The  
11 lead applicant is the County of Sacramento.

12 (135) Route 99/Sheldon Road; interchange project;  
13 reconstruction and expansion. Three million dollars  
14 (\$3,000,000). The lead applicant is the County of  
15 Sacramento.

16 (138) Cross Valley Rail; upgrade track from Visalia to  
17 Huron. Four million dollars (\$4,000,000). The lead  
18 applicant is the Cross Valley Rail Corridor Joint Powers  
19 Authority.

20 (139) Balboa Park BART Station; phase I expansion.  
21 Six million dollars (\$6,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
22 San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

23 (140) City of Goshen; overpass for Route 99. One  
24 million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000). The  
25 lead applicant is the department.

26 (141) Union City; pedestrian bridge over Union  
27 Pacific rail lines. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The  
28 lead applicant is the City of Union City.

29 (142) West Hollywood; repair, maintenance, and  
30 mitigation of Santa Monica Boulevard. Two million  
31 dollars (\$2,000,000). The lead applicant is the City of West  
32 Hollywood.

33 (144) Seismic retrofit of the national landmark Golden  
34 Gate Bridge. Five million dollars (\$5,000,000). The lead  
35 applicant is the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and  
36 Transportation District.

37 (145) Construction of a new siding in Sun Valley  
38 between Sheldon Street and Sunland Boulevard. Six  
39 million five hundred thousand dollars (\$6,500,000). The

1 lead applicant is the Southern California Regional Rail  
2 Authority.

3 (146) Construction of Palm Drive Interchange. Ten  
4 million dollars (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
5 Coachella Valley Association of Governments.

6 (148) Route 98; widening of 8 miles between Route 111  
7 and Route 7 from 2 lanes to 4 lanes. Ten million dollars  
8 (\$10,000,000). The lead applicant is the department.

9 (149) Purchase of low-emission buses for express  
10 service on Route 17. Three million seven hundred fifty  
11 thousand dollars (\$3,750,000). The lead applicant is the  
12 Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.

13 (150) Renovation or rehabilitation of Santa Cruz  
14 Metro Center. One million dollars (\$1,000,000). The lead  
15 applicant is the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.

16 (151) Purchase of 5 alternative fuel buses for the  
17 Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System. One million one  
18 hundred thousand dollars (\$1,100,000). The lead  
19 applicant is the Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System.

20 (152) Pasadena Blue Line transit-oriented mixed-use  
21 development. One million five hundred thousand dollars  
22 (\$1,500,000). The lead applicant is ~~the Los Angeles~~  
23 ~~County Metropolitan Transportation Authority of the~~  
24 ~~City of South Pasadena.~~

25 (153) Pasadena Blue Line utility relocation. Five  
26 hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$550,000). The lead  
27 applicant is the City of South Pasadena.

28 (154) Route ~~135~~—134/I-5 interchange study. One  
29 hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000). The lead applicant  
30 is the department.

31 (156) Seismic retrofit and core segment  
32 improvements for the Bay Area Rapid Transit system.  
33 Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). The lead applicant  
34 is the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

35 (157) Route 12; Congestion relief improvements from  
36 Route 29 to I-80 through Jamison Canyon. Seven million  
37 dollars (\$7,000,000). The lead applicant is the  
38 department.

39 (158) Remodel the intersection of Olympic Boulevard  
40 ~~and Lemon, Mateo Street, and Porter Street~~ and install

1 a new traffic signal. Two million dollars (\$2,000,000). The  
2 lead applicant is the City of Los Angeles.

3 *(159) Route 101; redesign and construction of Steele*  
4 *Lane interchange. Six million dollars (\$6,000,000). The*  
5 *lead applicant is the department or the Sonoma County*  
6 *Transportation Authority.*

7 (b) As used in this section “route” is a state highway  
8 route as identified in Article 3 (commencing with Section  
9 300) of Chapter 2 of Division 1 of the Streets and  
10 Highways Code.

11 *SEC. 6. Section 14556.50 of the Government Code is*  
12 *amended to read:*

13 14556.50. The grant authorized under paragraph (32)  
14 of subdivision (a) of Section 14556.40 shall be allocated as  
15 follows:

16 (a) (1) Two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000)  
17 to defray the administrative costs of the North Coast  
18 Railroad Authority, allocated directly to the authority *as*  
19 *directed by the commission at its first scheduled meeting*  
20 immediately upon enactment of the Budget Act of 2000.

21 (2) Two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) to  
22 defray the administrative costs of the authority, allocated  
23 directly to the authority *as directed by the commission*  
24 within six months from the date of enactment of the  
25 Budget Act of 2000.

26 (3) Five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) to  
27 defray the administrative costs of the authority, allocated  
28 to the authority as directed by the commission, within one  
29 year from the date of enactment of the Budget Act of  
30 2000, if the commission determines that additional  
31 funding is needed by the authority *as directed by the*  
32 *commission at its first scheduled meeting* for  
33 administrative costs.

34 (b) Six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000) to fund  
35 completion of the authority’s rail line from Lombard to  
36 Willits, allocated directly to the authority immediately  
37 upon enactment of the Budget Act of 2000.

38 (c) One million dollars (\$1,000,000) to fund  
39 completion of the authority’s rail line from Willits to  
40 Arcata, allocated to the authority as directed by the

commission, within ~~four~~ six months from the date of enactment of the Budget Act of 2000.

(d) Five million dollars (\$5,000,000) to fund the upgrade of the authority's rail line to Class II or III status, allocated to the authority as directed by the commission.

(e) Four million one hundred thousand dollars (\$4,100,000) for environmental remediation projects, allocated to the authority as directed by the commission, within ~~four~~ six months from the date of enactment of the Budget Act of 2000.

(f) Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) for the authority's debt reduction, allocated to the authority as directed by the commission, within ~~four~~ six months from the date of enactment of the Budget Act of 2000.

(g) One million eight hundred thousand dollars (\$1,800,000) for use by the authority as local match funds, allocated to the authority as directed by the commission.

(h) Five million five hundred thousand dollars (\$5,500,000) to fund repayment of the authority's federal loan obligations, allocated to the authority as directed by the commission.

(i) Thirty-one million dollars (\$31,000,000) for long-term stabilization projects, allocated to the authority as directed by the commission.

*SEC. 7. Section 14556.52 of the Government Code is amended to read:*

14556.52. (a) Before grants from the fund may be allocated to any of the three Alameda Corridor East Projects identified in paragraphs (54), (55), and (73) of subdivision (a) of Section 14556.40, a report shall be completed and submitted to the commission within one year of the operative date of this section. The report shall be prepared by a team consisting of the lead applicants for those projects *and the Riverside County Transportation Commission*. The report shall address regional mobility needs as well as regional, state, and national economic impacts of the corridor. The team shall also evaluate and assess the technical merits, determine the phasing and delivery schedule, and identify a financing strategy for the proposed corridor



1 improvements. ~~The~~ *Based on the good faith participation*  
2 *of the stakeholders,* the commission shall allocate some or  
3 all of the available funds to one or more of the lead  
4 applicants for specific projects within the corridor that  
5 meet the requirements under this chapter.

6 *(b) Funds may be allocated from the fund to produce*  
7 *the report required under this section.*

8 SEC. 8. Section 7104 of the Revenue and Taxation  
9 Code is amended to read:

10 7104. (a) The Transportation Investment Fund  
11 (hereafter the fund) is hereby created in the State  
12 Treasury. *Notwithstanding Section 13340 of the*  
13 *Government Code, the money in the fund is continuously*  
14 *appropriated without regard to fiscal years for*  
15 *disbursement in the manner and for the purposes set*  
16 *forth in this section.*

17 (b) All of the following shall occur on a quarterly basis:

18 (1) The State Board of Equalization, in consultation  
19 with the Department of Finance, shall estimate the  
20 amount that is transferred to the General Fund under  
21 subdivision (b) of Section 7102 that is attributable to  
22 revenue collected for the sale, storage, use, or other  
23 consumption in this state of motor vehicle fuel, as defined  
24 in Section 7304.

25 (2) The State Board of Equalization shall inform the  
26 Controller, in writing, of the amount estimated under  
27 paragraph (1).

28 (3) The Controller shall transfer the amount  
29 estimated under paragraph (1) from the General Fund  
30 to the fund.

31 (c) For each quarter during the period commencing  
32 on July 1, 2001, and ending on June 30, 2006, the Controller  
33 shall make all of the following transfers *and*  
34 *apportionments* from the ~~fund~~ *funds identified for*  
35 *transfer under paragraph (2) of subdivision (b)* in the  
36 following order:

37 (1) To the ~~Transportation~~ *Traffic* Congestion Relief  
38 Fund created in the State Treasury by Section 14556.5 of  
39 the Government Code, the sum of one hundred sixty-nine  
40 million five hundred thousand dollars (\$169,500,000), for

1 a total transfer of three billion three hundred ninety  
2 million dollars (\$3,390,000,000).

3 (2) To the Public Transportation Account, a trust fund  
4 in the State Transportation Fund, 20 percent of the  
5 amount remaining after the transfer required under  
6 paragraph (1). Funds transferred under this paragraph  
7 shall be appropriated by the Legislature as follows:

8 (A) To the Department of Transportation, 50 percent  
9 for purposes of subdivision (a) or (b) of Section 99315 of  
10 the Public Utilities Code.

11 (B) To the Controller, 25 percent for allocation  
12 pursuant to Section 99314 of the Public Utilities Code.  
13 Funds allocated under this subparagraph shall be subject  
14 to all of the provisions governing funds allocated under  
15 Section 99314 of the Public Utilities Code.

16 (C) To the Controller, 25 percent for allocation  
17 pursuant to Section 99313 of the Public Utilities Code.  
18 Funds allocated under this subparagraph shall be subject  
19 to all of the provisions governing funds allocated under  
20 Section 99313 of the Public Utilities Code.

21 (3) To the Department of Transportation *for*  
22 *expenditure* for programming for transportation capital  
23 improvement projects subject to all of the provisions  
24 governing the State Transportation Improvement  
25 Program, 40 percent of the amount remaining after the  
26 transfer required under paragraph (1).

27 (4) To *the Controller for apportionment to* the  
28 counties, including a city and county, 20 percent of the  
29 amount remaining after the transfer required under  
30 paragraph (1), in accordance with the following  
31 formulas:

32 (A) Seventy-five percent of the funds payable under  
33 this paragraph shall be apportioned among the counties  
34 in the proportion that the number of fee-paid and exempt  
35 vehicles that are registered in the county bears to the  
36 number of fee-paid and exempt vehicles registered in the  
37 state.

38 (B) Twenty-five percent of the funds payable under  
39 this paragraph shall be apportioned among the counties  
40 in the proportion that the number of miles of maintained

1 county roads in each county bears to the total number of  
2 miles of maintained county roads in the state. For the  
3 purposes of apportioning funds under this subparagraph,  
4 any roads within the boundaries of a city and county that  
5 are not state highways shall be deemed to be county  
6 roads.

7 (5) To *the Controller for apportionment to* cities,  
8 including a city and county, 20 percent of the amount  
9 remaining after the transfer required under paragraph  
10 (1). ~~Fund~~ *Funds* transferred under this paragraph shall  
11 be apportioned among the cities in the proportion that  
12 the total population of the city bears to the total  
13 population of all the cities in the state.

14 (d) Funds received under paragraphs (4) and (5) of  
15 subdivision (c) shall be deposited as follows in order to  
16 avoid the commingling of those funds with other local  
17 funds:

18 (1) In the case of a city, into the city account that is  
19 designated for the receipt of state funds allocated for  
20 transportation purposes.

21 (2) In the case of a county, into the county road fund.

22 (3) In the case of a city and county, into a local account  
23 that is designated for the receipt of state funds allocated  
24 for transportation purposes.

25 (e) Funds allocated to a city, county, or city and  
26 county under this section shall be used only for street and  
27 highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction,  
28 and storm damage repair. For purposes of this section, the  
29 following terms have the following meanings:

30 (1) "Maintenance" means either or both of the  
31 following:

32 (A) Patching.

33 (B) Overlay and sealing.

34 (2) "Reconstruction" includes any overlay, sealing, or  
35 widening of the roadway, if the widening is necessary to  
36 bring the roadway width to the desirable minimum width  
37 consistent with the geometric design criteria of the  
38 department for 3R (reconstruction, resurfacing, and  
39 rehabilitation) projects that are not on a freeway, but

1 does not include widening for the purpose of increasing  
2 the traffic capacity of a street or highway.

3 (3) “Storm damage repair” is repair or reconstruction  
4 of local streets and highways and related drainage  
5 improvements that have been damaged due to winter  
6 storms and flooding, and construction of drainage  
7 improvements to mitigate future roadway flooding and  
8 damage problems, in those jurisdictions that have been  
9 declared disaster areas by the President of the United  
10 States, *where the costs of those repairs are ineligible for*  
11 *emergency funding with Federal Emergency Relief*  
12 *(ER) funds or Federal Emergency Management*  
13 *Administration (FEMA) funds.*

14 (f) (1) Cities and counties shall maintain their  
15 existing commitment of local funds for street and  
16 highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction,  
17 and storm damage repair in order to remain eligible for  
18 the allocation of funds pursuant to paragraph (4) or (5)  
19 of subdivision (c).

20 (2) In order to receive any allocation pursuant to  
21 paragraph (4) or (5) of subdivision (c), the city or county  
22 shall annually expend from its general fund for street,  
23 road, and highway purposes an amount not less than the  
24 annual average of its expenditures from its general fund  
25 during the 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99 fiscal years, as  
26 reported to the Controller pursuant to Section 2151 of the  
27 Streets and Highways Code. For purposes of this  
28 paragraph, in calculating a city’s or county’s annual  
29 general fund expenditures and its average general fund  
30 expenditures for the 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99 fiscal  
31 years, any unrestricted funds that the city or county may  
32 expend at its discretion, including vehicle in-lieu tax  
33 revenues and revenues from fines and forfeitures,  
34 expended for street and highway purposes shall be  
35 considered expenditures from the general fund.  
36 One-time allocations that have been expended for street  
37 and highway purposes, but which may not be available on  
38 an ongoing basis, including revenue provided under the  
39 Teeter Plan Bond Law of 1994 (Chapter 6.6  
40 (commencing with Section 54773) of Part 1 of Division 2

1 of Title 5 of the Government Code, may not be  
2 considered when calculating a city's or county's annual  
3 general fund expenditures.

4 (3) *For any city incorporated after July 1, 1996, the*  
5 *Controller shall calculate an annual average of*  
6 *expenditure for the period between July 1, 1996, and*  
7 *December 31, 2000, that the city was incorporated.*

8 (4) For purposes of paragraph ~~(4)~~ (2), the Controller  
9 may request fiscal data from cities and counties,  
10 *including, but not limited to, the certification required*  
11 *under Section 14556.26 of the Government Code, in*  
12 addition to data provided pursuant to Section 2151, for the  
13 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99 fiscal years. Each city and  
14 county shall furnish the data to the Controller not later  
15 than 120 days after receiving the request. The Controller  
16 may withhold payment to cities and counties that do not  
17 comply with the request for information or that provide  
18 incomplete data.

19 ~~(4) At the conclusion of each fiscal year during which~~  
20 ~~a city or county receives funding under paragraph (4) or~~  
21 ~~(5) of subdivision (c), the Controller shall verify the city's~~  
22 ~~or county's compliance with paragraph (1)~~

23 (5) *The Controller may perform audits to ensure*  
24 *compliance with paragraph (2) when deemed necessary.*  
25 Any city or county that has not complied with paragraph  
26 ~~(4)~~ (2) shall reimburse the state for the funds it received  
27 during that fiscal year. Any funds withheld or returned as  
28 a result of a failure to comply with paragraph ~~(4)~~ (2) shall  
29 be reallocated to the other counties and cities whose  
30 expenditures are in compliance.

31 ~~(5)~~

32 (6) If a city or county fails to comply with the  
33 requirements of paragraph ~~(4)~~ (2) in a particular fiscal  
34 year, the city or county may expend during that fiscal  
35 year and the following fiscal year a total amount that is not  
36 less than the total amount required to be expended for  
37 those fiscal years for purposes of complying with  
38 paragraph ~~(4)~~ (2).

39 ~~(6)~~

1 (7) The allocation made under paragraph (4) or (5) of  
2 subdivision (c) shall be expended not later than the end  
3 of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the  
4 allocation was made, and any funds not expended within  
5 that period shall be returned to the Controller and shall  
6 be reallocated to the other cities and counties pursuant to  
7 the allocation formulas set forth in paragraph (4) or (5)  
8 of subdivision (c).

9 (g) The Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
10 Transportation Authority shall give first priority for using  
11 its share of the funds made available under subparagraphs  
12 (B) and (C) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) to  
13 providing the levels of bus service mandated under the  
14 consent decree entered into by the authority on October  
15 29, 1996, in the case of Labor/Community Strategy  
16 Center, et al. v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
17 Transportation Authority.

18 ~~(h) This section shall become inoperative on June 30,~~  
19 ~~2006, and, as of January 1, 2007, is repealed, unless a later~~  
20 ~~enacted statute that is enacted before January 1, 2007,~~  
21 ~~deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes~~  
22 ~~inoperative and is repealed.~~ *For the purpose of allocating*  
23 *funds under this section to counties, cities, and a city and*  
24 *county, the Controller shall use the most recent*  
25 *population estimates prepared by the Demographic*  
26 *Research Unit of the Department of Finance. For a city*  
27 *that incorporated after January 1, 1998 that does not*  
28 *appear on the most recent population estimates prepared*  
29 *by the Demographic Research Unit, the Controller shall*  
30 *use the population determined for that city under Section*  
31 *11005.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.*

32 (i) *This section shall become inoperative on the date*  
33 *that all encumbrances incurred for the projects funded*  
34 *under paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) have been*  
35 *liquidated or on June 30, 2006, whichever date is later, and*  
36 *as of the January 1 immediately following that date is*  
37 *repealed.*

38 SEC. 9. *Section 2182 of the Streets and Highways*  
39 *Code is amended to read:*

1 2182. (a) The funds appropriated from the Traffic  
2 Congestion Relief Fund pursuant to *subdivision (b) of*  
3 ~~Section 21 of the act that added this section 14556.5 of the~~  
4 *Government Code* shall be allocated by the Controller to  
5 cities and counties for street and road maintenance,  
6 rehabilitation, and reconstruction. Four hundred million  
7 dollars (\$400,000,000) shall be allocated to the counties,  
8 including a city and county, and cities, including a city  
9 and county, as follows:

10 (1) Fifty percent to the counties, including a city and  
11 county, in accordance with the following formulas:

12 (A) Seventy-five percent of the funds payable under  
13 this paragraph shall be apportioned among the counties  
14 in the proportion that the number of fee-paid and exempt  
15 vehicles that are registered in the county bears to the  
16 number of fee-paid and exempt vehicles registered in the  
17 state.

18 (B) Twenty-five percent of the funds payable under  
19 this paragraph shall be apportioned among the counties  
20 in the proportion that the number of miles of maintained  
21 county roads in each county bears to the total number of  
22 miles of maintained county roads in the state. For the  
23 purposes of apportioning funds under this subparagraph,  
24 any roads within the boundaries of a city and county that  
25 are not state highways shall be deemed to be county  
26 roads.

27 (2) Fifty percent to cities, including a city and county,  
28 apportioned among the cities in the proportion that the  
29 total population of the city bears to the total population  
30 of all the cities in the state.

31 (b) Funds received under this section shall be  
32 deposited as follows in order to avoid the commingling of  
33 those funds with other local funds:

34 (1) In the case of a city, into the city account that is  
35 designated for the receipt of state funds allocated for  
36 transportation purposes.

37 (2) In the case of a county, into the county road fund.

38 (3) In the case of a city and county, into a local account  
39 that is designated for the receipt of state funds allocated  
40 for transportation purposes.



1 (c) Funds apportioned to a city or county under this  
 2 section shall be used only for street and highway  
 3 pavement maintenance, rehabilitation, and  
 4 reconstruction of necessary associated facilities such as  
 5 drainage and traffic control devices. Rehabilitation or  
 6 reconstruction may include widening necessary to bring  
 7 the roadway width to the desirable minimum pavement  
 8 width consistent with accepted design standards for local  
 9 streets and roads, but does not include widening or  
 10 increasing the traffic capacity of a street or road.

11 (d) *For the purpose of allocating funds under this*  
 12 *section to cities, counties, and a city and county, the*  
 13 *Controller shall use the most recent population estimates*  
 14 *prepared by the Demographic Research Unit of the*  
 15 *Department of Finance. For a city that incorporated after*  
 16 *January 1, 1998, that does not appear on the most recent*  
 17 *population estimates prepared by the Demographic*  
 18 *Research Unit, the Controller shall use the population*  
 19 *determined for that city under Section 11005.3 of the*  
 20 *Revenue and Taxation Code.*

21 SEC. 10. *Section 2182.1 of the Streets and Highways*  
 22 *Code is amended to read:*

23 2182.1. (a) The Legislature finds and declares that it  
 24 intends cities and counties to use the funds made  
 25 available ~~from Section 21 of the act that added this section~~  
 26 *under subdivision (b) of Section 14556.5 of the*  
 27 *Government Code* to supplement existing local revenues  
 28 being used for maintenance and rehabilitation of local  
 29 streets and roads. Cities and counties shall maintain their  
 30 existing commitment of local funds for maintenance and  
 31 rehabilitation of local streets and roads in order to remain  
 32 eligible for allocation and expenditure of the additional  
 33 four hundred million dollars (\$400,000,000) made  
 34 available by Section 21 of the act that added this section.

35 (b) In order to receive any allocation pursuant to  
 36 Section 2182, the city or county shall annually expend  
 37 from its general fund for street, road, and highway  
 38 purposes an amount not less than the annual average of  
 39 its expenditures from its general fund during the 1996–97,  
 40 1997–98, and 1998–99 fiscal years, as reported to the

1 Controller pursuant to Section 2151. For purposes of this  
2 subdivision, in calculating a city's or county's annual  
3 general fund expenditures and its average general fund  
4 expenditures for the 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99 fiscal  
5 years, any unrestricted funds that the city or county may  
6 expend at its discretion, including vehicle in-lieu tax  
7 revenues and revenues from fines and forfeitures,  
8 expended for street and highway purposes shall be  
9 considered expenditures from the general fund.  
10 One-time allocations that have been expended for street  
11 and highway purposes, but which may not be available on  
12 an ongoing basis, including revenue provided under the  
13 Teeter Plan Bond Law of 1994 (Chapter 6.6  
14 (commencing with Section 54773) of Part 1 of Division 2  
15 of Title 5 of the Government Code, may not be  
16 considered when calculating a city's or county's annual  
17 general fund expenditures.

18 (c) *For any city incorporated after July 1, 1996, the*  
19 *Controller shall calculate an annual average of*  
20 *expenditure for the period between July 1, 1996, and*  
21 *December 31, 2000, that the city was incorporated.*

22 (d) For purposes of subdivision ~~(a)~~ (b), the Controller  
23 may request fiscal data from cities and counties,  
24 including, but not limited to, the certification required  
25 under Section 14556.26 of the Government Code, in  
26 addition to data provided pursuant to Section 2151, for the  
27 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99 fiscal years. Each city and  
28 county shall furnish the data to the Controller not later  
29 than 120 days after receiving the request. The Controller  
30 may withhold payment to cities and counties that do not  
31 comply with the request for information or that provide  
32 incomplete data.

33 ~~(d) At the conclusion of each fiscal year during which~~  
34 ~~a city or county receives funding under Section 2182, the~~  
35 ~~Controller shall verify the city's or county's compliance~~  
36 ~~with subdivision (a)~~

37 (e) *The Controller may perform audits to ensure*  
38 *compliance with subdivision (b) when deemed*  
39 *necessary.* Any city or county that has not complied with  
40 subdivision ~~(a)~~ (b) shall reimburse the state for the funds

1 it received during that fiscal year. Any funds withheld or  
2 returned as a result of a failure to comply with subdivision  
3 ~~(a)~~ (b) shall be reallocated to the other counties and  
4 cities whose expenditures are in compliance.

5 ~~(e)~~

6 (f) If a city or county fails to comply with the  
7 requirements of subdivision ~~(a)~~ (b) in a particular fiscal  
8 year, the city or county may expend during that fiscal  
9 year and the following fiscal year a total amount that is not  
10 less than the total amount required to be expended for  
11 those fiscal years for purposes of complying with  
12 subdivision ~~(a)~~ (b).

13 ~~(f)~~

14 (g) The allocation made under Section 2182 shall be  
15 expended not later than the end of the fiscal year  
16 following the fiscal year in which the allocation was made,  
17 and any funds not expended within that period shall be  
18 returned to the Controller and shall be reallocated to the  
19 other cities and counties pursuant to the allocation  
20 formulas set forth in Section 2182.

21 *SEC. 11. Section 21 of Chapter 91 of the Statutes of*  
22 *2000 is repealed.*

23 ~~SEC. 21. The sum of four hundred million dollars~~  
24 ~~(\$400,000,000) is hereby appropriated from the Traffic~~  
25 ~~Congestion Relief Fund to the Controller for allocation to~~  
26 ~~cities and counties, including a city and county, for the~~  
27 ~~purposes of Section 2182 of the Streets and Highways~~  
28 ~~Code.~~

29 ~~SEC. 10.~~

30 *SEC. 12. The following amounts are hereby*  
31 *appropriated for the following purposes:*

32 (a) *The sum of one million nine hundred thousand*  
33 *dollars (\$1,900,000) from the Public Transportation*  
34 *Account in the State Transportation Fund to the Capitol*  
35 *Corridors Joint Powers Authority for the purpose of*  
36 *expanding intercity rail service in the Capitol Corridor.*

37 (b) (1) *The sum of twelve million dollars*  
38 *(\$12,000,000) from the Public Transportation Account in*  
39 *the State Transportation Fund to the Bay Area Water*  
40 *Transit Authority to fund the environmental impact*

1 reports and design functions specified in Chapter 1011 of  
2 the Statutes of 1999, ~~and to purchase ferries and~~  
3 ~~appropriate infrastructure for the establishment of a~~  
4 ~~high-speed water transit system for San Francisco Bay.~~

5 (2) Of the amount specified in paragraph (1), six  
6 million dollars (\$6,000,000) shall be available no sooner  
7 than 30 days after the Bay Area Water Transit Authority  
8 submits a work plan to the appropriate legislative fiscal  
9 committees and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.  
10 The work plan shall specify the intended work elements  
11 to be accomplished in the budget year, when the work  
12 will be initiated and is projected to be completed, and the  
13 cost associated with each item of work.

14 ~~SEC. 11.~~

15 SEC. 13. This act is an urgency statute necessary for  
16 the immediate preservation of the public peace, health,  
17 or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the  
18 Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts  
19 constituting the necessity are:

20 This act helps to create a significant program designed  
21 to reduce traffic congestion, which will improve the  
22 health and safety of the public. In order for the program  
23 enhanced by this act to be implemented as soon as  
24 possible, it is necessary that this take effect immediately.

25 ~~enacting this act to make the necessary statutory changes~~  
26 ~~to implement the Budget Act of 2000 relative to the~~  
27 ~~administration of state government.~~

28 ~~SEC. 2. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the~~  
29 ~~immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or~~  
30 ~~safety within the meaning of Article IV of the~~  
31 ~~Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts~~  
32 ~~constituting the necessity are:~~

33 ~~In order to implement the Budget Act of 2000 with~~  
34 ~~respect to the administration of state government, it is~~  
35 ~~necessary that this act take effect immediately.~~